Textual description: Did the team include a textual description of their solution? Is it understandable? Is the described process correct?

Code quality: Is the code readable and concise? Does it use the powerful features of the libraries, or does it re-implement everything from scratch?

Results: Is the final result correct? Are all the assumptions well justified? Are there textual comments/visualizations to convince you of the final result?

Textual description: - Too short, does not give enough description of what is done and why, How does it work that it is done in this way? This counts for the longer cells. Depends too much on comments in code.

+ Small cells have just enough description. Descriptions after almost each cell, tells something about what the cell did and the result, makes it a lot more readable (before task 2, cleaning data, and in task 3)

Code quality: -

+ 2. A) long cells but each line is easy to understand pandas function together with a comment of what it does.

Results: - Show intermediate result so I can better see what each step does. Could have been better to show how “right-leaned” a canton was in 3. A). Misstake in PS change histogram in 3. B), says its for UDC.

+ Good results, show us the “properties” of the dataframe, before task 2. Short and concise -> very good notebook

The review:

The textual descriptions of what each cell does and its result are short, but they also communicate the result and what was done or needs to be done in a nice way. The notebook gets very readable because of this. I like the way you show the reader the different properties of the dataframe you have derived from the voters.xlm in the start of task 2. It is part of showing why the maps you create are going to look like they do, e.g. that two of the cantons are not going to have results.

Each cell is very short, thanks to the good use of the different functionality in the libraries. This adds to the readability and simplicity of understanding the code. The code is also decently commented, only using comments in the larger cells.

When showing if a canton is right-leaned or not it could have been a better idea to show how right-leaned it was, instead of just showing it as a binary value, e.g. “yes” or “no”. It would have given the reader a better impression of the “right-leaningness” of each canton. Also, when some of the maps have a legend that show the values for the different colour/shades used to fill it, why not use this for every map instead of using a markdown cell below the map to show this? I’m thinking about two of the maps in task 3. B).

In the change in vote share histogram for PS in task 3.B), you have instead written UDC.

All in all, this was a very pleasant notebook to review and it shows that the writers know what they are doing and that’s the impression I’m left with.

Grades:

Textual description: 5.5

Code quality: 6

Results: 5.5